



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ἐγκαλεῖν ἔχεις and Bruhn's conjecture τέκμαρ (709), which are adopted in the text, are both unnecessary. Vs. 917. If, as seems likely, the original reading of L was εἰ . . . λέγοι, this should be adopted in preference to ἦν . . . λέγει, since it is amply supported by *Al.* 521, 1159, 1344, *O.C.* 352, *Ant.* 666, 1032, *O.T.* 314, 979, etc. Vs. 1021. ὀνομάζετο is an affectionate middle, "he called me *his own* child." Emendation is not needed. Vs. 1064. The imperative δρᾶ suits Jocasta's excited state of mind (cf. 1056, 1057, 1061) better than the infinitive δρᾶν (so Bruhn), and it is not necessary that 1064 should conform in structure to 1065. Vss. 1462 f. In adopting the fem. dual forms ταῦν 1462, αῖν 1463, 1466, ταύταιν 1504, Bruhn accepts the evidence of the MSS (see Kühner-Blass I 604; II 584) in preference to that of the inscriptions (Meisterhans³ 123). Cf. τοῖν φίλοιν δακρυρροοῦντων 1472. In the Critical Appendix ὕπο στραφεῖς 728, κατῆλθ' 117, and ὄλεθρον 1343 are attributed as conjectures to Ed. Schwartz, but the first comes from the MSS, the others had been made by previous scholars, F. Ascherson and Turnebus, and all are found in one or more texts.

It goes without saying that in spite of criticism this is an excellent edition of the play, improved through a long series of revisions.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER

EMORY COLLEGE

De poetarum Atticorum arte scaenica quaestiones quinque. Scripsit
PAULUS GRAEBER. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1911. Pp. 60. M.
1.50.

The more important conclusions advanced in this dissertation are as follows: "In Aeschylus and twice in Sophocles, when a new character enters the scene, he converses first with the chorus (or *coryphaeus*), even if another actor is already present; especially striking instances are *Persae* 249 and 681. Of course, this practice arose in the one-actor period and lapsed after the addition of a third actor. Incidentally, it has a bearing on the stage question, for it is inconceivable that an actor should regularly ignore another actor on the stage beside him in favor of the chorus in the orchestra below" (chap. i).

The second chapter, "De choro et histrionibus," contains little that is new except the hypothesis that the number of *choreutae* in the early chorus was fifteen, which was reduced to fourteen, thirteen, and twelve as the first, second, and third actors were added by the successive promotion of *coryphaei*. There is no use pointing out that this ignores the traditional derivation of tragedy from a dithyrambic chorus of fifty, for Aristotle and his statements on this subject are utterly *de trop* nowadays and it is popular to trample them under foot; in fact, Graeber is himself a convert to Dieterich's theory that the histrionic element in Greek drama came from Eleusis. But Graeber's hypothesis also runs afoul of comedy; for, since the formal recognition

of comedy at the City Dionysia fell within the two-actor period, the tragic chorus must at that time have contained thirteen *choreutae* and the double comic chorus ought to have consisted of twenty-six, not twenty-four.

"New characters are frequently made known to the audience by being announced just before they arrive on the scene. Aeschylus' method of announcement is characterized as follows: (a) the announcement is given by the chorus (*coryphaeus*), (b) at the character's first entrance, and (c) is not repeated at subsequent appearances. Sophocles and Euripides agree with Aeschylus in observing (a) in their older plays, but later represent one actor as announcing another. The first instance of this later device is found in the *Medea*, and it is usually employed only in the case of such actors as appear through the *πάροδοι*, rarely of those appearing through the *scaenae frons*. In Aristophanes (a) hardly occurs except in tragic parodies. Sophocles (in his two earlier plays) and Euripides occasionally ignore (c). As regards (b), Sophocles distinguished between characters with definite names and messengers, herdsman, nurses, etc.—the latter, being recognizable from their clothing, are never introduced" (chap. iii). I have cited only the more plausible generalizations of this chapter. It is a weakness of Graeber's to formulate a rule or general statement upon the slightest excuse. This tendency to force his evidence is apparent everywhere in his thesis. In consequence, he rests under the necessity of explaining away numerous exceptions—with varying degrees of success. It is not so much that the interpretations which he is thus compelled to adopt have never been advocated before, but that the rapidly accumulating mass of extreme views finally becomes (at least in some cases) an intolerable weight.

"Ancient playwrights experienced difficulty in inventing suitable motives for an actor's withdrawal and therefore occasionally left a character inactive on the scene during a choral ode; but this never happens when the *στάσιμον* is used to disguise the imaginary lapse of time" (chap. iv). If true, this dictum would be extremely valuable; unfortunately, the absence of stage directions renders most passages unsuitable for citation either pro or con. But does not Eur. *Hecuba* disprove it? At v. 437 Polyxena leaves for the tomb of Achilles, and Hecuba after giving expression to her sorrow faints away (438–43). The *στάσιμον* follows immediately (444–83) and at its conclusion (484) Talthybius enters and inquires where Hecuba may be found. The *coryphaeus* replies:

αὕτη πέλας σου νῶτ' ἔχουσ' ἐπὶ χθονί,
Ταλθύβιε, κείται ξυγκεκλήμενη πέπλοις (486 f).

It can therefore hardly be denied that Hecuba has been present throughout; but does condensation of time also take place at this point? Most assuredly; for Talthybius comes to announce the death of Polyxena who had left the scene but forty lines before, and his narrative shows that this sacrifice required a considerable interval.

Chap. v is devoted to an attempt to prove that two singing choruses (of councilors and women respectively) appeared in Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*.

It is tempting to take up smaller points in this suggestive pamphlet, filled, as it is, with shrewd observations and clever argumentation, but I must conclude with one final criticism. Have matters come to such a pass that writers of German dissertations must be asked to study the literature of their subject? Γλαῦκ' Ἀθήναζε! Except for two text editions in the Oxford Classical Series, Graeber cites not a single non-German book or article. However it may be in other fields, in scenic matters American work (to say nothing of English and French work) cannot be ignored with safety. Dignan's thesis on *The Idle Actor in Aeschylus* would have been useful to Graeber on almost every other page. He acknowledges no acquaintance with Rees's *The So-called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama* and his numerous supplementary papers, with Professor White's "An Unrecognized Actor in Greek Comedy" (*Harvard Studies* XVII, 103 ff.), or MacRae's "Date of the Extant *Prometheus* of Aeschylus" (*A.J.P.* XXX, 405 ff.)—all of which would have borne directly upon different aspects of his theme. On p. 15 note might profitably have been taken of Professor Capps's conclusions (*A.J.A.* X, 290 f.). But it is useless to extend this list—so far as Graeber is concerned, the English and French languages have no existence.

ROY C. FLICKINGER

Die politische Wirksamkeit der griechischen Frau. Eine Nachwirkung vorgriechischen Mutterrechtes. Von DR. PHIL. OTTO BRAUNSTEIN. Leipzig: Druck von August Hoffman in Kommission bei Gustave Fock, 1911.

The title of this excellent treatise is somewhat misleading. The reader who expects to find a discussion of the political influence of Greek women will be disappointed, for "politische" is used "im Sinne des griechischen Staatsrechtes, das heisst kommunalpolitische."

Starting with the material assembled by Paris in his dissertation entitled *Quatenus feminae res publicas in Asia minore Romanis imperantibus attigerint?* he makes use of all the available evidence without limitation as to locality or time. The conclusion reached in the first chapter, which deals with the citizenship of women, is that, while throughout Hellas citizenship was always accorded to women in theory, they were expressly described as citizens only in Asia Minor. The offices filled by women include liturgies and magistracies. Among liturgies are γυμνασιαρχία, ἀγωνοθεσία, πανηγυριαρχία, ἐστίασις(?). The magistracies held by women were "Archontat, Prytanie, Stephanephorie, Demiurgie, Hipparchie, Strategie, Dekaprotie."